Jackson Launches—and Symington Debunks—A New Missile Gap, P. 2

And B-52s, We Suppose, Are Doves

"I rate myself as a deeply committed pacifist."—*Nixon to C. L. Sulzberger* New York Times *March 9.*

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

VOL. XIX, No. 6 MARCH 22, 1971 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

Imperialism Is Not Internationalism

Internationalism made its appearance in American foreign policy with the administration of Woodrow Wilson. It rested on three premises whose validity was demonstrated by the great power rivalry which culminated in World War I. The first was that balance of power politics could not be relied on to preserve peace but only exacerbated mutual suspicion. The second was that the arms race which accompanied balance of power politics had itself become a primary source of tension and war. The third was the need for a world organization as a framework for peaceful settlement of international disputes and for the reduction of national armies to levels necessary only for internal order. This was the grand design with which Wilson declared America's intervention in Europe a "war to end war" and sought unsuccessfully to make that a reality by leading the United States into the League of Nations. By those standards Nixon is not an internationalist but an imperialist.

Not Every Little Firefight

On several occasions Nixon has wrapped himself in the mantle of Wilson and invoked the rhetoric of World War I to support the Vietnamese conflict.* But the policies outlined by Nixon in his interview with C. L. Sulzberger, as in his new state of the world message, clearly outline an attempt singlehandedly to police the world. The supposed "low posture" of the Nixon Doctrine turns out to be little more than an optical illusion to appease a public sick of unilateral intervention. "Of course," Nixon told Sulzberger, "we're not going to get into every little firefight everywhere." But where other nations "are ready to fight a fire" we "should be able to furnish the hose and water." These homely but deceptive analogies apply only to the sideshows. "Our responsibilities," Nixon said grandly, "are not limited to this great continent, but include Europe, the Middle East, Southeast Asia, East Asia, many areas whose fate affects the peace of the world." This covers just about every place on earth except the South Pole. Of course our motives, Nixon says, are benign. But there has never been an imperialism yet from Kipling's "white man's burden" to the Kaiser's "Kultur" which did not claim to be altruistic.

Considering the territorial sweep of the Nixon Doctrine, it is hard to see how he can "seriously doubt" that "we will ever have another war" and add as he did, "This is probably the very last one." For a man who claims "I know this world" how can he overlook the scores of national rivalries and conflicts in this vast area, any one of them capable of flaring up into a good-sized "firefight" at any time? No cop ever volunteered for a wider and more dangerous beat. Yet Nixon could also say in the same interview that the period of "expansion as typified by Theodore Roosevelt and the idea of Manifest Destiny" is "fortunately gone." No one ever dreamt in TR's day that we would some day consider it our destiny to impose a Pax Americana on the whole world, or to wield a Big Stick as big as our present Pentagon. Nixon told Sulzberger we confronted two great powers, Russia and China "motivated by a philosophy which announces itself as expansionist in character." What could be more expansionist than the Nixon Doctrine itself? It is dangerous to have a leader so unaware of any mote in his own eye.

In a realm of discourse in which words have lost all normal meaning, it is not surprising to hear that Nixon also told Sulzberger, "I rate myself as a deeply committed pacifist." Many men have been "committed" for less obvious lapses from reality. His is a pacifism which does not require extended surveillance by military intelligence. Nixon's pacifism implies a perpetual arms race. "We can't," he said, "foolishly fall behind in the arms competition." This from the leader of the world's most heavily armed nation, with an arms budget almost as big as the rest of the world's combined!

Even Laird, whose whoppers fill one with reluctant admiration, has never gone as far in misrepresentation as Nixon did when he told Sulzberger, "The Soviets now have three times the missile strength of ourselves . . . By 1974 they will pass us in subs carrying nuclear missiles." Table 2 of Laird's new posture report shows that we can launch 2600 nuclear "force loadings" or more than twice as many as the Soviet's 2,000. By 1974 the Soviets may pass us in the number of nuclear submarines but only because we plan to concentrate on MIRVing our fleet, increasing the number and accuracy of its warheads rather than the number of submarines.* The Institute for Stra-

(Continued on Page Four)

Nixon And That Silent Majority

Let us give the people of America a chance, a bigger voice in deciding for themselves those questions that so greatly affect their lives.

—Nixon in his State of the Union message Jan. 22.

I am certain a Gallup poll would show that the great majority of the people would want to pull out of Vietnam. But a Gallup poll would also show that a great majority of the people would want to pull three or more divisions out of Europe. And it would also show that a great majority of the people would cut our defense budget. Polls are not the answer.

—Nixon to Sulzberger New York Times *March 10.*

Neither it seems—for Nixon—is majority rule.

*** I am describing Wilsonianism at its best. At its worst, in dealing with Latin America, it was as imperialistic as the "dollar diplomacy" of Roosevelt and Taft which the Democrats had criticized.**

*** As with land-based ICBMs where we have also concentrated on MIRVing Minutemen. The Soviets may be ahead of us in numbers of ICBMs but many are obsolete and few are solid-fuel. For a full picture see my "Memo to the AP: How Laird Lied" in the New York Review of Books last June 4.**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Golda Meir's Hard-Line Position Would Bar A Palestinian Arab State . . .

THE BEST GUARANTEE OF SECURE BORDERS lies in friendly neighbors. Israel has a good case for some adjustments in the 1967 borders. But to push beyond this is to make harder the reconciliation with the Arabs on which Israel's future in the long run depends. The hard line taken by Mrs. Golda Meir in her interview with the London *Times* (*N.Y. Times* March 13) would prevent the establishment of a Palestinian state and reduce the West Bank to Israeli tutelage but without the benefits either of inclusion in Israel or of a separate state. Her views are disputed by many in Israel, including leading figures in her own party like Eliav and Sapir. A good discussion of the internal Israeli debate by a leading Israeli journalist, Victor Cygielman, may be found in the March issue of *Le Monde Diplomatique*. We hope American Jewish opinion will not let itself be stampeded into a monolithic lobby for the hard-liners nor allow Mrs. Meir to stall in the hope of injecting the Israeli issue into next year's Presidential campaign. There are already signs of movement toward a coalition of Zionists with the AFI-CIO and the arms lobbyists behind Jackson for the Democratic nomination. This is a time for Israeli magnanimity to match Egypt's readiness for peace.

The Truth About Tchepone

WHEN THE TRUTH ABOUT THE LAOS CAMPAIGN begins to leak out, we believe it will appear as a costly failure and it will be acknowledged that Tchepone itself was never taken by the ARVN forces. A careful review of the dispatches reveals (1) that the U.S. command was remarkably silent about Tchepone's supposed capture, (2) that Saigon began to admit that only reconnaissance teams had entered Tchepone and that the town was not (sour grapes!) worth taking, and (3) that some of ARVN's best battalions have been chewed up in this operation. Earlier in this invasion one could hear speculation that the French might have won at Dienbienphu with more air support and that, with the ARVN as "bait", our gunships were going to wreak havoc with the other side when they counter-attacked. Now a typical headline (*New York Daily News*, March 13) tells a different story, "South Viets Quit Sepone as 30,000 Reds Close In." Instead of seizing the chance to decimate the enemy from the air, we are ferrying out the ARVN troops in a swift retreat. Everybody lies in wartime, but we think our side has the bigger liars in this one. We recommend for a view from the other side Wilfred Burchett's account in *The Guardian* March 13. We believe it closer to the truth than the U.S.-ARVN accounts.

ACCORDING TO CHARLES BARTLETT (*Wash. Star* Mar. 9) Nixon had a fresh slice of that Ho Chi Mihn trail oil pipeline flown in on top priority for his press conference of March 4 in case anybody had asked him about the credibility gap created by the previous pipeline section shown at the Pentagon Feb. 24. The Pentagon admitted later that this earlier sample was not a trophy of our current incursion into Laos but had been obtained before. The important fact about this pipeline never did get into the papers, though revealed by Gen. Vogt himself at the Pentagon briefing. He said the pipeline was made up of sections with "a very clever simple disconnect system." Gen. Vogt explained that this disconnect feature despite intensive bombing "has made it possible for the North Vietnamese to take a ruptured section of the pipe out in a few minutes and insert a new section, and the flow continues." How ingenious those Stone Age people are!

FORMER SENATOR YOUNG OF OHIO calls attention to a shift in the ratio of non-combat to combat deaths in Indochina. Since 1961 deaths due to accidents have averaged 20 percent

But Papadapoulos Is Our Pet While Allende's In The Doghouse

Elizabeth Drew (Atlantic Monthly): To what extent are we going to be concerned about what kind of governments come to power where?

Secretary Rogers: Well, I think we're going to be less concerned about that than we have in the past for the simple reason that we've found we can't affect the outcome to the degree that we thought we could.

Mrs. Drew: Well, let's take an example—Chile. We have said that we will not interfere with its domestic policies but we're going to watch closely its foreign policies and we made it pretty clear we disapprove of its establishing relations with Cuba. But what do we do about it? What are our sanctions?

Secretary Rogers: Well, we're not going to use sanctions in the sense that you use the word.

Mrs. Drew: Is that all we'll do, is to say we don't like it?

Secretary Rogers: Well, that's true in many cases. It's true in the case of Greece. We have very friendly relations with Greece but we've made it clear that we're somewhat disappointed that they haven't moved toward representative government more quickly.

Mrs. Drew: There's a question as to how clear—

Secretary Rogers: We've made it crystal clear.

—On PBS "30 Minutes With . . ." WETA March 9.

We've also made it pretty clear we prefer right wing dictators to freely elected Marxists.

Jackson (Violating Secrecy) Launches—and Symington Rebuffs—A New Missile Scare

Sen. Jackson: It will come, I think, as a shock to a lot of Americans, after much discussion here, that they'd leveled off on the deployment of the SS-9's, to know that the Russians are in the process of deploying a new generation, an advance generation, of offensive systems . . . the new developments are ominous indeed. We do not know quite what it means, but I can say to you that these are huge, new missiles.

Robert Novak [columnist]: You say ominous, sir, do you mean that you think, seriously the Soviets might entertain a first strike with these weapons?

Jackson: I'm sure that I can't answer that question. I can only say to you, when you look at these huge weapons systems, you have to ask, what can they be used for, other than a first strike?

—Face The Nation, March 7

Many new occurrences come with spring—some pleasant—warmer weather, Japanese cherry blossoms; some not so pleasant—proposed higher defense budgets, warnings of grave new dangers to this country because of new developments in Soviet weaponry. Last week, in a session secret to the point where no record was kept, the Senate Armed Services Committee was briefed about Soviet missile plans. This briefing included for the first time purported details of new Soviet missilery. One cannot fail to remember several comparable Spring announcements of previous years—in the early 1950's those thousands of long-range bombers the Soviets were going to build, but never built; in the late 1950's those hundreds upon hundreds of long-range missiles the Soviets were going to build, but never built. As a result of these and other inaccurate intelligence reports, however, the American taxpayer is currently bearing the burden of tens of billions of dollars of additional weaponry we know now is not needed for his or our security.

—Symington (D-Mo.), *in the Senate, March 10*

Symington speaks from experience. He was himself taken in by the bomber and missile gap scares of the 50s and 60s. He chose this way to tell the Senate that the information used by Jackson was classified. He might also have added that all U.S. intelligence has seen are *holes* for new missiles, not the missiles themselves. Jackson is an old hand at whipping up arms race nightmares.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. . . Picking A Master of Advertising Fakery As Chairman of the SEC

of those in combat. Young notes that last December the Pentagon listed more non-combat than combat deaths: 160 to 138. During the past two weeks non-combat deaths have been more than 50 percent of combat deaths: the March 4 report gave 69 and 37; the March 11—44 and 23. The official term—deaths due to "non-hostile' action— is vaguer than non-combat, since men may die in combat without being hit by the enemy. Young's suspicions were aroused when the son of an Ohio constituent was listed as dead of sunstroke. The father was startled, since this was a farm boy accustomed to working in the sun. Young queried the Pentagon. The father and the widow then received telegrams explaining that death by sunstroke was assumed since the body lay in the sun before being evacuated and was burned red. Later three bullet wounds were found. Is the rise in deaths attributed to non-hostile causes a "body count" in reverse, designed to minimize casualties? Won't some Senator ask for a full explanation?

FBI And Faceless Informers

SENATOR MCGOVERN'S TEMERITY in criticizing J. Edgar Hoover for "exiling" to Montana a dissident FBI agent has brought down upon him a mini-avalanche of abusive letters. These he put into the *Congressional Record* March 8. They represent something less than an outpouring of popular indignation. All 20 letters came from veteran FBI men, eight of them assistant directors and one an assistant *to* the director. One deserves notice from historians. All through the witch hunt of the 50s, Hoover defended the use of anonymous informers and often charged (as he did Oct. 3, 1955 to the International Association of Chiefs of Police) that there was a "conspiracy" to discredit "faceless informers" run by "Communist lawyers, skilled in concealing foul and despicable acts behind the Fifth amendment." But now ten younger FBI men have written McGovern a letter criticizing the FBI (*Con. Rec.* March 1 p. S2163) but withheld their names for fear of retaliation. "I am not impressed," Ivan W. Conrad, Assistant Director of the FBI wrote in protest "by the statements of 'faceless' accusers; such accusers are foreign to the American philosophy." The FBI had better check him out.

THE SEC WAS SET UP TO PROTECT investors from false claims. Wm. J. Casey, Nixon's choice for SEC chairman, has been his No. 1 agent in fake advertising. In 1969 Casey turned up as head of a "grass roots" organization claiming that 84% of the American people favored an ABM. The "grass roots" turned out to be Room 495 in the White House annex. A few months later he was appointed adviser to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. In October of that year full page ads called for "silent Americans" to speak up for Nixon's Vietnam policy. The chairman again was Casey. On November 17 there was a full page ad in the *New York Times*, "Hold Your Ears Hanoi: Here Comes America's Silent Majority." There was Casey's name again along with other such silent Americans as Clare Booth Luce and Leo Cherne. Such fakery, if used to sell stock, would violate the Securities Act. Thanks to Senator Proxmire, the hearings on Casey disclosed that he has already been in trouble under the Securities Act. Casey settled one investor suit against himself out of court (along with a plagiarism case) and is defendant in another. But this odoriferous appointment will probably be confirmed.

U.S. Intervention's Double Standard

Almost every instance of the use of presidential force in the past has been against small, backward, and distraught peoples: the situation today. Call the roll of the victims of presidential application of force in the past: Spanish Florida, Honduras, Santo Domingo, Nicaragua, Panama, Haiti, Guatemala, a China torn by civil war, a Mexico distraught by civil war, a Russia and a Vietnam riven by war—it is a sobering fact that presidents do not rush in with the weapons of war to bring Britain, France, Italy, Russia, or Japan to heel. Would we have bombarded Southampton to collect a debt? Would we have sent an expedition into Rome to protect Americans against a threat from a fascist government? Would we have precipitated a war with Britain over a boundary dispute in Maine? Would we bomb Siberia for years if shots were fired—without any hits—at an American vessel? And does it realy comport with the honor and dignity of a great nation to indulge its Chief Executive in one standard of conduct for the strong and another for the weak?

—Henry Steele Commager—the dean of American historians—before Senate Foreign Relations, March 8.

How The Presidential Power To Make War Has Grown To Imperial Dimensions

Five times in the past ten years Presidents have mounted major military interventions in foreign nations without prior consultation with the Congress: the Bay of Pigs, the invasion of the Dominican Republic, the attacks on North Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. None of these now appear to have represented a genuine emergency; none were in response to attacks upon the United States. None therefore appear to meet the requirements for the exercise of war powers by the President formulated by the makers of the Constitution.

There is no ambiguity about the intent of the Framers of the Constitution. They proposed to make it impossible for a "ruler" to plunge the nation into war. The founding fathers were determined that no American executive would have the power of a George III or a Frederick the Great.

It is only in the last twenty years or so that Presidents appear to have thrown caution and even constitutional scruples to the wind, and ventured, on their own authority, into military operations that were in fact acts of war, that were on a large scale, that were in distant parts of the globe. Our current presidential commitments are justified by new doctrines such as that of "Vital Interest" or by the "Nixon Doctrine" of shared responsibility. Of both of these it can be said that their most conspicuous feature is the fog which enshrouds them. Thus Secretary Rusk's assertion in 1966 that "no would-be aggressor should suppose that the absence of a defense treaty, Congressional declaration, or United States military presence, grants immunity to aggression;" the key words, for our purposes, are "absence of treaty" and "absence of Congressional declaration."

The assumption of our constitution framers, that Presidents could not engage in war on their own, was greatly strengthened by the elementary fact that he could not if he wanted to because there were no armies or navies with which to war. At the time of the ratification of the Constitution the U.S. Army consisted of 719 officers and men, not a formidable force for military adventures. The situation did not change perceptibly over the years. Our armed forces increased to some 20,000 by 1840, to 28,000 on the eve of the Civil War and to 38,000 by 1890. Even in 1915, with the world locked in mortal combat, the armed forces of the United States were less than 175,000.

Now we have a wholly new situation. Not only do we keep some three million men under arms at all times—since 1951 the number has rarely fallen below that—but we have the greatest and most formidable armaments that any nation ever commanded. What this means is quite simply that while in the past Presidents could not involve the nation, or the world, very deeply in war without Congressional approval, now they can—and do.

—Henry Steele Commager before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee March 8 (abridged).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How Nixon Is Concentrating Power In The White House

(Continued from Page One)

tegic Studies estimates that by 1975 our strategic forces will have 11,000 nuclear warheads while the Soviets in this insane race may reach 5,000, or still less than half as many. Then if war comes our overkill will be four times—and the Soviet's 2½ times—what it is today. That should make us all feel more secure. Yet Nixon closed the Sulzberger interview with an argument for giving arms expenditure higher priority than health, education and environment. "After all," Nixon said brightly, "if we manage to improve the environment and living conditions in this country we must also assure that we will be around to enjoy these improvements." We haven't heard such clinchers since we left high school.

Power To The People?

Nixon's philosophy of representative government matches his foreign and military policy. Here, too, what he says and how he portrays himself do not match what he is doing. Only Jules Feiffer has begun to do justice to his quick change artistry, now a Pentagon pacifist, in a Ghandi loincloth; now, with the "power to the people" theme in his State of the Union message, practically a Black Panther in a dashiki. The point Senator Symington tried to make in his "Kissinger syndrome" speech in the Senate March 2 is that Nixon has been insulating himself more and more from Congressional and popular control by concentrating power in a greatly enlarged White House staff. The press, always avid for personality clashes, focussed on Kissinger and Rogers. It overlooked the fundamentals of what Symingon was trying to say. Though Nixon talked in the 1968 campaign of "streamlining" the White House staff, its numbers have more than doubled and its cost has tripled. By moving more and more of the decision-making process particularly in foreign policy into the White House, where those who take part are protected by "executive privilege" from interrogation by Congress, Nixon has covertly moved power further away from, not closer to, "the people."

The anti-imperialists who fought the annexation of the Philippines in the 1890s warned that imperialism would weaken democracy. Even they could hardly have imagined that a future government could carry on a war in Indochina so plainly against the popular will. "Frankly," Nixon told Sulzberger in talking of opposition to the war among the elite, "I have far more confidence in our people than in the Establishment." He shows it in strange ways. At one point he said to Sulzberger, "In 1966 and 1967—culminating in 1968—the American people began to tire of playing a role in the world." What they tired of was the war in Vietnam and heavy military spending, of interventionism and the Pax Americana, not of "playing a role in the world" but of Lyndon Johnson's conception of that role and Nixon's which is really the same as LBJ's. That all this is contrary to popular will was admitted by Nixon himself when he said in the Sulzberger interview that he was "certain a Gallup poll would show" (in fact the polls *have* shown) that "the great majority" want to get out of Vietnam, to reduce our military forces in Europe and "cut our defense budget." Then he added lamely "but polls are not the answer." Two years ago Nixon was appealing to a silent majority. Now that it is no longer silent, he is saying that it must be ignored. This is the Caesarism inseparable from empire.

March 14

Still Underestimating the North Vietnamese

The disruption of the supply lines of the enemy through Laos, which has now occurred for three weeks, has very seriously damaged the enemy's ability to wage effective action against our remaining forces in Vietnam and assures even more the success of our troop withdrawal program.

—From Nixon's press conference, March 4.

"The whole panhandle is full of potential trail routes," the military said. Using the west half of the panhandle does not put the communists further away from South Vietnam in terms of total mileage, they said. The U.S. military says the enemy is unable to cut across the Savannakhet Plain because it is an area open to air strikes and, later in the season, muddy. Lao generals discount this U.S. assessment. "The Americans are always underestimating the North Vietnamese capability to move, just like the French did at Dienbienphu," a Lao general said.

—Tammy Arbuckle from Laos, Wash. Star *Mar. 4.*

The 1970 Index Is Ready Free If You Send A Stamped Addressed Envelope For It

Bi-Weekly Mart

—To subscribe or to send a gift subscription, send $5 with your address and zip code to the address below.

—To get Stone's new collection, **"Polemics and Prophecies: 1967-70"** (Random House: $10) at the special $8.95 price postpaid for Bi-Weekly readers, send check or money order to the address below.

—If you want Stone's new paperback, **"The Killings at Kent State: How Murder Went Unpunished"** (New York Review and Vintage Press) the price is $1.95. It contains the full text, available nowhere else, of the so-called "secret FBI report", the summary of FBI findings prepared by the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department but never submitted to the Ohio Grand Jury.

—Stone's **"Hidden History of the Korean War"**, the inside story of America's first Vietnam, long out of print is available again (Monthly Review Press) $7.50 postpaid.

—Paperback editions (Vintage Press) of Stone's earlier collections, **"In A Time of Torment"** ($1.95) and **"The Haunted Fifties"** ($2.45) at bookstores.

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly
4420 29th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20008
$5 A YEAR 3/22/71

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly
4420 29th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20008

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly, 2d Class Postage Paid at Washington, D.C. Published every other Monday except in August at 4420 29th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. An independent bi-weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $17 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED